



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

SEP 28 2010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

**RESEARCH IN MOTION
ATTN: GLENDA WOLFE
BUILDING 6, BRAZOS EAST, SUITE 100
5000 RIVERSIDE DRIVE
IRVING TX 75039**

In re Application of	:	
Thanh V. Vuong	:	
Application No. 10/785,189	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: February 25, 2004	:	
Attorney Docket No. 16813-13US	:	

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 05, 2010, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to file an appeal brief (and fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2)) within the time period provided in Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review (Notice). As an appeal brief (and appeal brief fee) was not filed within one (1) month of the Notice of Appeal dated October 16, 2009, and no extension of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) was obtained, the appeal was dismissed and the proceedings as to the rejected claims were terminated. See 37 CFR 1.197(b). As no claim was allowed, the application became abandoned on November 17, 2009. See MPEP 1215.04.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an appeal brief, (2) the petition fee of \$1620, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, the reply to the final Office Action of September 17, 2008 is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.


There is no indication that the person signing the petition was ever given a power of attorney to prosecute the application. If the person signing the petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney document must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until appropriate instructions are received.

In regard to the previously submitted request for change of correspondence address noted in the instant petition, petitioner should note that only an attorney of record can make such a request.

The application file does not indicate a change of address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. A change of address should be filed in this case in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application will be mailed solely to the address of record.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Tredelle Jackson at (571) 272-2783.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2626 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the reply received.



Ramesh Krishnamurthy
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: **MICHAEL VAN EESBEEK**
OGILVY RENAULT LLP
200 BAY STREET
SUITE 3800
TORONTO ON CANADA M5J 2Z4